

Amusements and Meetings To-night.

ACADEMY OF MUSIC.—Concert.

Index to Advertisements.

ADVERTISEMENTS.—11th Page.—5th and 6th columns. ANNOUNCEMENTS.—10th Page.—1st column. BOARD AND ROOMS.—10th Page.—4th column. BUSINESS NOTICES.—11th Page.—1st column. DANCING ACADEMIES.—11th Page.—4th and 5th columns. ENTERTAINMENTS.—11th Page.—1st column. FINANCIAL.—10th Page.—1st column. GRAVES AND FUNERALS.—10th Page.—5th column. HEALTH.—11th Page.—2d, 3d, 4th and 5th columns. INSTRUCTIONS.—11th Page.—2d and 3d columns. LOST AND FOUND.—11th Page.—1st column. MARRIAGES AND MATRIMONY.—7th Page.—4th and 5th columns. MISCELLANEOUS.—11th Page.—1st column; 12th Page.—1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th and 6th columns. METEOROLOGICAL.—11th Page.—1st column. NEW PUBLICATIONS.—10th Page.—5th column. OCEAN STEAMERS.—10th Page.—5th column. PROPOSALS.—11th Page.—1st column. REAL ESTATE.—11th Page.—1st column. RELATIONS WANTED.—11th Page.—4th and 5th columns. SPECIAL NOTICES.—11th Page.—1st column. STEAMBOATS AND RAILROADS.—10th Page.—5th and 6th columns. TEACHERS.—11th Page.—3d column.

Business Notices.

"ALDERNEY BRAND"

AN ACCEPTABLE DISCOUNT TO A lady would be a contribution to a charitable cause. The "Alderney Brand" is a fine quality of woolen goods, made in England, and is sold at a discount of 25 per cent. It is a fine quality of woolen goods, made in England, and is sold at a discount of 25 per cent. It is a fine quality of woolen goods, made in England, and is sold at a discount of 25 per cent.

DOMINGO SHERREY. Grown on MACHANADO, the finest vineyard in Spain. Property of Señor D. Pedro Dominguez.

IF YOUR DISCREETIVE ORGANS are out of order, consult the "Alderney Brand" woolen goods. They are the most effective and reliable of any woolen goods. They are the most effective and reliable of any woolen goods.

NICE FOR CHRISTMAS AND ALWAYS USEFUL. If you wish to give a gift that will be useful and appreciated, give the "Alderney Brand" woolen goods. They are the most effective and reliable of any woolen goods.

IT IS A WONDERFUL FACT that the "Alderney Brand" woolen goods are so popular. They are the most effective and reliable of any woolen goods. They are the most effective and reliable of any woolen goods.

"UNDER THE SNOW," a story in rhyme, by the Rev. Robert C. Bly, and "Our Best Friend," by the Rev. George H. Thompson. Published by the New York Evening Express on Sunday.

WHERE YOU AT THE SEVENTH REGIMENT BATTALION? Whether you were or not you should read the report in the New York Evening Express on Sunday.

TERMS OF THE TRIBUNE.

Published twice in the United States. DAILY TRIBUNE, 1 year, \$12.00. DAILY TRIBUNE (without Sunday), 1 year, \$10.00. WEEKLY TRIBUNE, 1 year, \$3.00. SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE, 1 year, \$3.00.

BLANCH OFFICES OF THE TRIBUNE. NEW-YORK.—No. 1,238 Broadway, corner Third-st. No. 812 Sixth-st., bet. Fifth-st. and Broadway. CHICAGO.—No. 209 West Twenty-third-st., cor. Eighth-st. No. 763 Third-st., corner Forty-ninth-st. No. 92 East Fourteenth-st., corner Union-st. No. 2,376 Broadway, (Marion). WASHINGTON.—No. 1,322 Fall. LONDON.—No. 26 Bedford-st., Strand. PARIS.—No. 9, Rue Serpente.

New-York Daily Tribune.

FOUNDED BY HORACE GREELEY.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1880.

TRIPLE SHEET.

THE NEWS THIS MORNING.

FOREIGN.—The London cable dispatch to THE TRIBUNE shows that well-defined differences of opinion on the Irish agitation exist in the British Cabinet; a large majority of the members of Parliament favor a conciliatory measure for Ireland. Mr. Chamberlain leads the opposition to Mr. Forster in the Cabinet; the authorities place great confidence in the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act as a means of establishing order. The Steamer Roman Monarch has been launched on the Clyde. The Rev. Messrs. Dale and Enright have been provisionally released from jail. Moscow students have been fighting with the police. A native King on the west coast of Africa has been arrested and placed on board a British gunboat, where he was sentenced to imprisonment. F. F. O'Brien, a large real estate owner, is under arrest for forgery in Montreal.

DOMESTIC.—General Grant, it is said, intends to revisit Mexico. Mrs. Katherine Chase-Sprague has begun a suit for divorce from her husband. By the postponement of an election case in the courts it is said that the organization of the Tennessee House of Representatives will be in the hands of the Republicans. A railway accident at East Derby, N. H., yesterday, seriously injured several persons. The Botrice trial at Honolule, Penn., resulted yesterday in a verdict of murder in the second degree. A reception was given to Archibald Forbes last evening in Washington. Details of the insurance on the Buffalo property destroyed by fire on Friday are published. The Roman Catholic priests were ordained at Troy yesterday.

CONGRESS.—There was no session of the Senate yesterday. In the House the Military Academy Appropriation bill was passed. The vote on the Consular Diplomatic Appropriation bill was not finished.

CITY AND SUBURBAN.—George W. Williams has made a statement to a TRIBUNE reporter about a scheme for colonizing negroes in New Mexico. A standholder in Washington Market was probably fatally stabbed by a discharged employe yesterday. The Park Commissioners had a lively discussion in regard to the chairmanship of the Bank of Manhattan Company, dead. An experiment was made in lighting Broadway with electricity. A singular accident to a boiler occurred in West Twenty-sixth-st. The gas companies asked for larger appropriations for lighting streets and public buildings. A Christmas match was shot at Creedmoor. Many changes in the Tammany General Committee are looked for. Gold value of the legal-tender silver dollar (412 1/2 grains), 87.38 cents. Stocks active and buoyant, closing strong at a reaction from the highest figures.

THE WEATHER.—TRIBUNE local observations indicate partly cloudy or clear weather, and lower temperature. Thermometer yesterday: Highest, 51°; lowest, 20°; average, 25°.

Yesterday's meeting of the reconstructed Board of Public Parks was as animated as personalities could make it. The election of a President was finally deferred and will probably be settled after private consultations. Mr. Wales defined his position in the Department with his old-time clearness and practical wisdom.

Mr. Conger has expressed in the House the judgment which we formed during the earliest stage of the Whittaker case. It mattered very little whether the colored cadet was the victim of persecution or the author of his own misfortunes. The glaring fact which was brought to light was the wretched spirit of caste in an institution supported by the National Government. The institution needed something besides watching. The country has not forgotten this disgraceful chapter in

the history of the Military Academy, and it shares Mr. Conger's indignation.

The versatile Springer was full to the brim and fairly running over with political wisdom yesterday. He started the House by demonstrating that the great financial crisis of 1873 occurred under Republican rule when the High Tariff policy was in full force, and that the country has never been so prosperous as during the recent period of Democratic ascendancy in Congress. When asked in what respect the Tariff had been modified since 1873, he referred pompously to the abolition of the duty on quinine. It required the combined efforts of several Republicans, but in the end this irrepressible statesman was tightly corked.

The dispatches from Ireland have been so conflicting during the past week that our regular London correspondent's review of the situation is doubly welcome. He contradicts the rumor that Mr. Forster has at any time offered his resignation, and intimates that while Mr. Chamberlain is the leading opponent of coercion he will not leave the Cabinet. It is plain that the force policy has come to be regarded as a political as well as a public necessity. The Government can command a very large majority from the opening of the session, if coercive measures are proposed. If they show signs of weakness and vacillation, they may find themselves in a minority before they have been in office a year. Mr. Forster is warmly praised in our dispatches for his patience, judgment and decision. Never in the domestic history of the United Kingdom has there been a more pressing need of all the best qualities of practical statesmanship.

The strange adventures of an irrepressible boiler are recounted in the local columns. The fire had been put out at eleven, the workmen had gone home, and the boiler-house had been tightly padlocked. But at twelve midnight the boiler popped up like a champagne cork. Roof, clothes-line and telegraph wires were broken through like a spider's web and the boiler went higher and higher, twenty times as high as the moon, until the policeman on the corner of Twenty-sixth-st. and Sixth-ave. was unable to discover it with the aid of a powerful telescope. Then it came down, straight as an arrow, assuming a vertical attitude in a neighboring backyard about two hundred feet from its original fastenings. The journey was performed with safety and dispatch and the boiler was found at dawn little the worse for wear. A pair of gages had dropped into a skylight and started a longer, but otherwise the boiler was in excellent order, so that few repairs will be needed. As incidents of this kind always occur in groups the public should be cautioned against leaving clothes on the lines over night. A boiler on a tender is liable to find an anchorage in any and every backyard before Christmas.

TWO VIEWS OF THE TWO PARTIES.

Two noteworthy political papers appear in the January number of The North American Review, one by Senator Edmunds, entitled, "The Controlling Forces in American Politics," and the other by Senator Wallace, entitled, "The Mission of the Democratic Party." Both treat of the same subject—the attitude and relations to each other of the two great political organizations in the United States. Neither contains any very fresh contributions to the fund of material for current political discussion, or gives any clear glimpse of probable party action in the future; but each is valuable as a statement of the writer's side of the motives and beliefs of the party to which he belongs, and his view of the purposes of its opponents. Senator Edmunds finds the best way of showing the reason for the existence of the Republican party and of describing its aims and work to be in giving an account of the Democratic party, which he does with a somewhat caustic pen, yet with a rigid adherence to historic facts. The preponderating influence within the Democratic party, up to 1861, he says, were devoted, first to the protection and extension of slavery; second, to the propagation of the dogma of free trade; third, to restricting the National jurisdiction and the National laws within the narrowest limits with respect to elections of Representatives, the privileges of citizens, and internal improvements; fourth, to repressing the jurisdiction of the National Courts; and, fifth, to the propagation of the doctrine of the right of secession. The overthrow of the Rebellion has removed the first of these objects from the arena of practical politics, but whether the last has received its quietus remains for the future to determine. The others are still cherished, except that concerning internal improvements. Toward this the attitude of the party has undergone a change, and its members of Congress generally favor expenditures for such works on a scale that is liberal to the point of recklessness. The present doctrine of the Democracy in regard to the constitutional amendments, Mr. Edmunds says, is that the duties they devolve are the duties of States in their character as such, and that no legislation of Congress operating upon the persons of citizens is "appropriate." So, too, in regard to the laws of Congress for securing fair elections of members of the House. The attitude and policy of the Republican party can, he thinks, be understood from the statement of the position of its antagonist. He does not admit that the Democrats are genuine and consistent defenders of the real constitutional rights of the States, because in the important matter of electing a President the records of Congress show that they have voted against laws proposed by the Republicans binding Congress to recognize and obey the decision of such States in regard to all questions of the choice of its electors, and have sought to draw into the two houses an unlimited jurisdiction over the subject. This is a strictly correct presentation of the constitutional point at issue in the electoral controversy of 1877.

THE COMING MAN.

Several Christian churches properly set apart this week preceding Christmas for the careful consideration of the human character and influence upon the world of this Man who was born into it nearly nineteen centuries ago. A singular fact, familiar to all students of history, is that when He came He was expected in some vague way in every race and country. It was not the Jews alone who looked for a Messiah. In India they waited for the long absent Buddha again to appear. The Athenians had created an altar to the Unknown God. The Parsee Magians looked daily for the coming of Sosiosh, who was to teach the truth, to raise the dead, and to judge the world. Indeed it was from among these Macian priests who had prophecies His coming for ages that three were sent by God, guided by the star, to the stable to find their Saviour in the child of Mary.

The fact of this universal expectation is not singular, after all, when we consider it. The wants and thoughts of a man are always the same; they stretch in a long unbroken thread from Adam to the poorest new-boy who carries this earth. The Chaldean on his sandy desert, or the Mongolian three thousand years ago, felt that something was amiss in the world which needed mending, just as much as the New-Yorker does to-day.

He was tormented in the same way by his own incompetency; he felt himself unjustly balked by circumstances; he had his remorseful spasms of honesty and self-denial, and his long lapses into brutality and selfishness, like any poor fellow among ourselves turning into a drinking shop or gambling hell to-night. He wanted to be pulled up to a higher level; he wanted the world to be pulled up. His vices, caliphs or devils did not answer this demand any better than do our presidents, kings or elegants to-day. Hence in all ages humanity has been stretching out its hands to some Invisible Man who was to appear and set all things right. Among the Greeks it was Apollo, among the Hindus the warrior Krishna, while our own ancestors looked for Odin to come in human shape, kill the Wolf of Evil, and give to the world everlasting summer and quiet.

Oddly enough, the same desire is in every man now; the coming of Christ has not extinguished it, simply because we have not all satisfied ourselves that He is the helper we need. The reader of THE TRIBUNE this morning of a man thinking creature and not a mere animal satisfied with filling his stomach and warming his skin from day to day) must see that there is much that is wrong in the world which neither law nor science nor mechanical improvements nor even elarify will suffice to set right. Law does not make a white more human the mass of crime which it shuts up in of sight; charity cures with a poor depressing and transient growth unfashionable sterile depths in social life; and what can all your machinery or science do to restore a single drunken man or lost woman who shall walk the streets to-night? Every man hopes that the help for all this misery and mistake will be found some day. It will probably come, he thinks, for the world at large in the shape of a republic abroad and from a perfected system of government here; or from increased diffusion of knowledge, forgetting that the larger proportion of criminals in our prisons can read or write. For him-self individually happiness is to follow some lucky circumstance which he predicts, usually the increase of his income.

During this week, which precedes the anniversary of the birth of Jesus, what could each one of us do better than to consider whether all the help which the world needs did not come from Him? Political liberty, intelligence, and freedom of thought have dominated in every country, precisely as its citizens accepted and practised the teachings of Jesus in their purity; while tyranny and ignorance have gained ground in each just in proportion as they substituted petty dogmatism and selfishness for His broad truths and brotherly charity. It is noticeable, too, that no race nor religion has ever offered us a god or a hero worthy any respect of whom the qualities did not resemble those fully expressed by the Saviour. The modern rendering of the story of Saddertha or Buddha is borrowed in its finest details, even to his age, from the facts of the life of the Nazarene. Balder was beneficent and just. Zoroaster taught chastity and self-denial. Mahomet, temperance and submission; all gods and heroes, moral courage. Just in proportion as they embodied these truths their teachings have endured. Who are the men among ourselves whom we respect the most? Not the successful candidate of the millionaire, but the official who refuses a bribe, the public man who has tar-d to tell the truth, the physicians, nurses, and poor engineers who quietly give their lives to save their fellow-men. We don't pay them with rank or money; we leave their families to starve, perhaps, but secretly we humbly give them homage. Humanity can climb no higher than this, to be honest, true, self-sacrificing, and the most among us know it. This is the religion of Jesus.

As for a man's individual needs, does He meet them? That is the essential point after all. The gods of the Romans paid their worshippers with money. Mahomet promised to his sensual pleasures certain modern saints are said to reward the faithful with long life and health. Our Leader gives none of these things, but He lifts his disciple higher than poverty and disease and pain. "What matter what happens to me so that my soul is above it?"

THE BATTLE OF GRAVELLOTTE.

The proverbial difficulty of being sure of absolute accuracy in historical statements has casually received a curious illustration in a little controversy which, as we notice in a recent number of The Cincinnati Commercial, has occurred between Mr. Murat Halstead and Mr. Archibald Forbes. The matter is worth noticing in these columns, since the point really at issue between the two gentlemen in question is the action of a correspondent of THE TRIBUNE in communicating the tidings of the battle of Gravelotte to the London Daily News. Halstead puts forward certain corrections of statements made by Mr. Forbes in a lecture recently delivered by the latter in Boston, under the title of "The Inner Life of a War Correspondent." Mr. Forbes, dealing of course with the battle-field of the Old World, averred that it was an American citizen, Mr. Monrose Conway, who was the first to send by the telegraphic wire to a newspaper a full account of a battle—that battle being the battle of Gravelotte. He mentioned that soon after a little episode, to which he referred in detail, and which occurred on the day after the battle, Mr. Conway hurried to Saarbrück, and thence dispatched by wire the telegram in question—a performance which, Mr. Forbes continued, "inaugurated a new era in war correspondence."

Halstead, in commenting on these statements of Mr. Forbes, averred that Mr. Conway was the correspondent at Gravelotte of The London Daily News and The New-York World; that he did not refer to Saarbrück in his account of the battle, but wrote that account in the office of The Daily News in London; and that not Mr. Conway, but that he, Mr. Halstead, dispatched from Luxembourg a telegram which was "the first about the battle with the exception of those sent to Berlin by the German Emperor," who, by the way, was no Emperor, but only King, when Gravelotte was fought. In reply to Mr. Halstead's comments, Mr. Forbes makes the admission that he was in error in stating that Mr. Conway's account was telegraphed by that gentleman to London, and Saarbrück, and concludes that Mr. Halstead's avowal regarding its having been written in London by Mr. Conway after his return from the scene of action is correct.

Mr. Forbes was substantially accurate in his original statement, and consequently his acknowledgment of the accuracy of Mr. Halstead's counterstatement, and of course that counterstatement itself, are erroneous. The battle of Gravelotte was fought on Thursday, the 18th August, 1870, on Monday, the 22d of August, there appeared in THE TRIBUNE a detailed account of the battle, a column in length, dated "Gravelotte, Thursday, 18th August," telegraphed by its London representative, with the following preface: "The following account of Thursday's battle was written the same night on the field, forwarded by messenger to Saarbrück, and reaching London thence by telegraph on Sunday evening." The concluding sentence of this narrative runs as follows: "This goes to THE TRIBUNE by special messenger as far as Saarbrück, thence I hope by telegraph. You will have more detailed account at the earliest mo-

ment." So that although THE TRIBUNE's correspondent did not indeed himself, as stated by Mr. Forbes in his lecture, hurry to Saarbrück to dispatch his telegram, he had his message put on the wires at that frontier town by his messenger from the field.

The internal evidence is conclusive, but if further proof were needed it is to be found in the fact that THE TRIBUNE's correspondent, along with Mr. Halstead and Mr. Forbes, was on the battlefield on Friday, the day after the battle, after which time would not have allowed him to reach London soon enough to write a dispatch wired to America on Sunday night. The evidence adduced also obviously invalidates Mr. Halstead's claim that his telegram sent from Luxembourg was the first about the battle, with the exception of the official message sent to Berlin. Mr. Halstead was on the field the day after the battle, on which day, by his own acknowledgment, he had an interview with General Sheridan, who was with the German headquarters. This telegram from Luxembourg must have been subsequently dispatched, and must yield the priority to THE TRIBUNE's message forwarded from Saarbrück.

The "more detailed account" promised by the latter appeared in THE TRIBUNE of the 24th August, having been written in London on the previous day and transmitted thence by cable. Probably it is this later account which has been in the minds both of Mr. Halstead and Mr. Forbes; but the fact remains that a full account of the battle of Gravelotte was dispatched for THE TRIBUNE by its representative from the field, and telegraphed from Saarbrück, as originally in substance stated by Mr. Forbes in his lecture.

The British Government solved the quinine problem in 1891 so far as India is concerned by setting out the cinchona tree in the Nilgerry hills of India and in Ceylon. This was done with such care and in such numbers that last summer the Indian journals reported "millions of cinchona trees already yielding the Peruvian bark were in healthy growth. The price of quinine had already fallen in Ceylon from 50 to 70 cents per ounce." Indian farmers prophesy that in six or seven years the yield in bark will be large enough to admit of exportation. In the meantime the fall in the price of quinine has brought it within the reach of millions of the poorer classes who have never heretofore been able to buy it. It is hoped that as soon as India can extend the help for all this misery and mistake will be found some day. It will probably come, he thinks, for the world at large in the shape of a republic abroad and from a perfected system of government here; or from increased diffusion of knowledge, forgetting that the larger proportion of criminals in our prisons can read or write. For him-self individually happiness is to follow some lucky circumstance which he predicts, usually the increase of his income.

During this week, which precedes the anniversary of the birth of Jesus, what could each one of us do better than to consider whether all the help which the world needs did not come from Him? Political liberty, intelligence, and freedom of thought have dominated in every country, precisely as its citizens accepted and practised the teachings of Jesus in their purity; while tyranny and ignorance have gained ground in each just in proportion as they substituted petty dogmatism and selfishness for His broad truths and brotherly charity. It is noticeable, too, that no race nor religion has ever offered us a god or a hero worthy any respect of whom the qualities did not resemble those fully expressed by the Saviour. The modern rendering of the story of Saddertha or Buddha is borrowed in its finest details, even to his age, from the facts of the life of the Nazarene. Balder was beneficent and just. Zoroaster taught chastity and self-denial. Mahomet, temperance and submission; all gods and heroes, moral courage. Just in proportion as they embodied these truths their teachings have endured. Who are the men among ourselves whom we respect the most? Not the successful candidate of the millionaire, but the official who refuses a bribe, the public man who has tar-d to tell the truth, the physicians, nurses, and poor engineers who quietly give their lives to save their fellow-men. We don't pay them with rank or money; we leave their families to starve, perhaps, but secretly we humbly give them homage. Humanity can climb no higher than this, to be honest, true, self-sacrificing, and the most among us know it. This is the religion of Jesus.

As for a man's individual needs, does He meet them? That is the essential point after all. The gods of the Romans paid their worshippers with money. Mahomet promised to his sensual pleasures certain modern saints are said to reward the faithful with long life and health. Our Leader gives none of these things, but He lifts his disciple higher than poverty and disease and pain. "What matter what happens to me so that my soul is above it?"

THE BATTLE OF GRAVELLOTTE. The proverbial difficulty of being sure of absolute accuracy in historical statements has casually received a curious illustration in a little controversy which, as we notice in a recent number of The Cincinnati Commercial, has occurred between Mr. Murat Halstead and Mr. Archibald Forbes. The matter is worth noticing in these columns, since the point really at issue between the two gentlemen in question is the action of a correspondent of THE TRIBUNE in communicating the tidings of the battle of Gravelotte to the London Daily News. Halstead puts forward certain corrections of statements made by Mr. Forbes in a lecture recently delivered by the latter in Boston, under the title of "The Inner Life of a War Correspondent." Mr. Forbes, dealing of course with the battle-field of the Old World, averred that it was an American citizen, Mr. Monrose Conway, who was the first to send by the telegraphic wire to a newspaper a full account of a battle—that battle being the battle of Gravelotte. He mentioned that soon after a little episode, to which he referred in detail, and which occurred on the day after the battle, Mr. Conway hurried to Saarbrück, and thence dispatched by wire the telegram in question—a performance which, Mr. Forbes continued, "inaugurated a new era in war correspondence."

Halstead, in commenting on these statements of Mr. Forbes, averred that Mr. Conway was the correspondent at Gravelotte of The London Daily News and The New-York World; that he did not refer to Saarbrück in his account of the battle, but wrote that account in the office of The Daily News in London; and that not Mr. Conway, but that he, Mr. Halstead, dispatched from Luxembourg a telegram which was "the first about the battle with the exception of those sent to Berlin by the German Emperor," who, by the way, was no Emperor, but only King, when Gravelotte was fought. In reply to Mr. Halstead's comments, Mr. Forbes makes the admission that he was in error in stating that Mr. Conway's account was telegraphed by that gentleman to London, and Saarbrück, and concludes that Mr. Halstead's avowal regarding its having been written in London by Mr. Conway after his return from the scene of action is correct.

Mr. Forbes was substantially accurate in his original statement, and consequently his acknowledgment of the accuracy of Mr. Halstead's counterstatement, and of course that counterstatement itself, are erroneous. The battle of Gravelotte was fought on Thursday, the 18th August, 1870, on Monday, the 22d of August, there appeared in THE TRIBUNE a detailed account of the battle, a column in length, dated "Gravelotte, Thursday, 18th August," telegraphed by its London representative, with the following preface: "The following account of Thursday's battle was written the same night on the field, forwarded by messenger to Saarbrück, and reaching London thence by telegraph on Sunday evening." The concluding sentence of this narrative runs as follows: "This goes to THE TRIBUNE by special messenger as far as Saarbrück, thence I hope by telegraph. You will have more detailed account at the earliest mo-

ment." So that although THE TRIBUNE's correspondent did not indeed himself, as stated by Mr. Forbes in his lecture, hurry to Saarbrück to dispatch his telegram, he had his message put on the wires at that frontier town by his messenger from the field.

The internal evidence is conclusive, but if further proof were needed it is to be found in the fact that THE TRIBUNE's correspondent, along with Mr. Halstead and Mr. Forbes, was on the battlefield on Friday, the day after the battle, after which time would not have allowed him to reach London soon enough to write a dispatch wired to America on Sunday night. The evidence adduced also obviously invalidates Mr. Halstead's claim that his telegram sent from Luxembourg was the first about the battle, with the exception of the official message sent to Berlin. Mr. Halstead was on the field the day after the battle, on which day, by his own acknowledgment, he had an interview with General Sheridan, who was with the German headquarters. This telegram from Luxembourg must have been subsequently dispatched, and must yield the priority to THE TRIBUNE's message forwarded from Saarbrück.

The "more detailed account" promised by the latter appeared in THE TRIBUNE of the 24th August, having been written in London on the previous day and transmitted thence by cable. Probably it is this later account which has been in the minds both of Mr. Halstead and Mr. Forbes; but the fact remains that a full account of the battle of Gravelotte was dispatched for THE TRIBUNE by its representative from the field, and telegraphed from Saarbrück, as originally in substance stated by Mr. Forbes in his lecture.

The British Government solved the quinine problem in 1891 so far as India is concerned by setting out the cinchona tree in the Nilgerry hills of India and in Ceylon. This was done with such care and in such numbers that last summer the Indian journals reported "millions of cinchona trees already yielding the Peruvian bark were in healthy growth. The price of quinine had already fallen in Ceylon from 50 to 70 cents per ounce." Indian farmers prophesy that in six or seven years the yield in bark will be large enough to admit of exportation. In the meantime the fall in the price of quinine has brought it within the reach of millions of the poorer classes who have never heretofore been able to buy it. It is hoped that as soon as India can extend the help for all this misery and mistake will be found some day. It will probably come, he thinks, for the world at large in the shape of a republic abroad and from a perfected system of government here; or from increased diffusion of knowledge, forgetting that the larger proportion of criminals in our prisons can read or write. For him-self individually happiness is to follow some lucky circumstance which he predicts, usually the increase of his income.

During this week, which precedes the anniversary of the birth of Jesus, what could each one of us do better than to consider whether all the help which the world needs did not come from Him? Political liberty, intelligence, and freedom of thought have dominated in every country, precisely as its citizens accepted and practised the teachings of Jesus in their purity; while tyranny and ignorance have gained ground in each just in proportion as they substituted petty dogmatism and selfishness for His broad truths and brotherly charity. It is noticeable, too, that no race nor religion has ever offered us a god or a hero worthy any respect of whom the qualities did not resemble those fully expressed by the Saviour. The modern rendering of the story of Saddertha or Buddha is borrowed in its finest details, even to his age, from the facts of the life of the Nazarene. Balder was beneficent and just. Zoroaster taught chastity and self-denial. Mahomet, temperance and submission; all gods and heroes, moral courage. Just in proportion as they embodied these truths their teachings have endured. Who are the men among ourselves whom we respect the most? Not the successful candidate of the millionaire, but the official who refuses a bribe, the public man who has tar-d to tell the truth, the physicians, nurses, and poor engineers who quietly give their lives to save their fellow-men. We don't pay them with rank or money; we leave their families to starve, perhaps, but secretly we humbly give them homage. Humanity can climb no higher than this, to be honest, true, self-sacrificing, and the most among us know it. This is the religion of Jesus.

As for a man's individual needs, does He meet them? That is the essential point after all. The gods of the Romans paid their worshippers with money. Mahomet promised to his sensual pleasures certain modern saints are said to reward the faithful with long life and health. Our Leader gives none of these things, but He lifts his disciple higher than poverty and disease and pain. "What matter what happens to me so that my soul is above it?"

THE BATTLE OF GRAVELLOTTE. The proverbial difficulty of being sure of absolute accuracy in historical statements has casually received a curious illustration in a little controversy which, as we notice in a recent number of The Cincinnati Commercial, has occurred between Mr. Murat Halstead and Mr. Archibald Forbes. The matter is worth noticing in these columns, since the point really at issue between the two gentlemen in question is the action of a correspondent of THE TRIBUNE in communicating the tidings of the battle of Gravelotte to the London Daily News. Halstead puts forward certain corrections of statements made by Mr. Forbes in a lecture recently delivered by the latter in Boston, under the title of "The Inner Life of a War Correspondent." Mr. Forbes, dealing of course with the battle-field of the Old World, averred that it was an American citizen, Mr. Monrose Conway, who was the first to send by the telegraphic wire to a newspaper a full account of a battle—that battle being the battle of Gravelotte. He mentioned that soon after a little episode, to which he referred in detail, and which occurred on the day after the battle, Mr. Conway hurried to Saarbrück, and thence dispatched by wire the telegram in question—a performance which, Mr. Forbes continued, "inaugurated a new era in war correspondence."

Halstead, in commenting on these statements of Mr. Forbes, averred that Mr. Conway was the correspondent at Gravelotte of The London Daily News and The New-York World; that he did not refer to Saarbrück in his account of the battle, but wrote that account in the office of The Daily News in London; and that not Mr. Conway, but that he, Mr. Halstead, dispatched from Luxembourg a telegram which was "the first about the battle with the exception of those sent to Berlin by the German Emperor," who, by the way, was no Emperor, but only King, when Gravelotte was fought. In reply to Mr. Halstead's comments, Mr. Forbes makes the admission that he was in error in stating that Mr. Conway's account was telegraphed by that gentleman to London, and Saarbrück, and concludes that Mr. Halstead's avowal regarding its having been written in London by Mr. Conway after his return from the scene of action is correct.

Mr. Forbes was substantially accurate in his original statement, and consequently his acknowledgment of the accuracy of Mr. Halstead's counterstatement, and of course that counterstatement itself, are erroneous. The battle of Gravelotte was fought on Thursday, the 18th August, 1870, on Monday, the 22d of August, there appeared in THE TRIBUNE a detailed account of the battle, a column in length, dated "Gravelotte, Thursday, 18th August," telegraphed by its London representative, with the following preface: "The following account of Thursday's battle was written the same night on the field, forwarded by messenger to Saarbrück, and reaching London thence by telegraph on Sunday evening." The concluding sentence of this narrative runs as follows: "This goes to THE TRIBUNE by special messenger as far as Saarbrück, thence I hope by telegraph. You will have more detailed account at the earliest mo-

ment." So that although THE TRIBUNE's correspondent did not indeed himself, as stated by Mr. Forbes in his lecture, hurry to Saarbrück to dispatch his telegram, he had his message put on the wires at that frontier town by his messenger from the field.

The internal evidence is conclusive, but if further proof were needed it is to be found in the fact that THE TRIBUNE's correspondent, along with Mr. Halstead and Mr. Forbes, was on the battlefield on Friday, the day after the battle, after which time would not have allowed him to reach London soon enough to write a dispatch wired to America on Sunday night. The evidence adduced also obviously invalidates Mr. Halstead's claim that his telegram sent from Luxembourg was the first about the battle, with the exception of the official message sent to Berlin. Mr. Halstead was on the field the day after the battle, on which day, by his own acknowledgment, he had an interview with General Sheridan, who was with the German headquarters. This telegram from Luxembourg must have been subsequently dispatched, and must yield the priority to THE TRIBUNE's message forwarded from Saarbrück.

The "more detailed account" promised by the latter appeared in THE TRIBUNE of the 24th August, having been written in London on the previous day and transmitted thence by cable. Probably it is this later account which has been in the minds both of Mr. Halstead and Mr. Forbes; but the fact remains that a full account of the battle of Gravelotte was dispatched for THE TRIBUNE by its representative from the field, and telegraphed from Saarbrück, as originally in substance stated by Mr. Forbes in his lecture.

ment." So that although THE TRIBUNE's correspondent did not indeed himself, as stated by Mr. Forbes in his lecture, hurry to Saarbrück to dispatch his telegram, he had his message put on the wires at that frontier town by his messenger from the field.

The internal evidence is conclusive, but if further proof were needed it is to be found in the fact that THE TRIBUNE's correspondent, along with Mr. Halstead and Mr. Forbes, was on the battlefield on Friday, the day after the battle, after which time would not have allowed him to reach London soon enough to write a dispatch wired to America on Sunday night. The evidence adduced also obviously invalidates Mr. Halstead's claim that his telegram sent from Luxembourg was the first about the battle, with the exception of the official message sent to Berlin. Mr. Halstead was on the field the day after the battle, on which day, by his own acknowledgment, he had an interview with General Sheridan, who was with the German headquarters. This telegram from Luxembourg must have been subsequently dispatched, and must yield the priority to THE TRIBUNE's message forwarded from Saarbrück.

The "more detailed account" promised by the latter appeared in THE TRIBUNE of the 24th August, having been written in London on the previous day and transmitted thence by cable. Probably it is this later account which has been in the minds both of Mr. Halstead and Mr. Forbes; but the fact remains that a full account of the battle of Gravelotte was dispatched for THE TRIBUNE by its representative from the field, and telegraphed from Saarbrück, as originally in substance stated by Mr. Forbes in his lecture.

The British Government solved the quinine problem in 1891 so far as India is concerned by setting out the cinchona tree in the Nilgerry hills of India and in Ceylon. This was done with such care and in such numbers that last summer the Indian journals reported "millions of cinchona trees already yielding the Peruvian bark were in healthy growth. The price of quinine had already fallen in Ceylon from 50 to 70 cents per ounce." Indian farmers prophesy that in six or seven years the yield in bark will be large enough to admit of exportation. In the meantime the fall in the price of quinine has brought it within the reach of millions of the poorer classes who have never heretofore been able to buy it. It is hoped that as soon as India can extend the help for all this misery and mistake will be found some day. It will probably come, he thinks, for the world at large in the shape of a republic abroad and from a perfected system of government here; or from increased diffusion of knowledge, forgetting that the larger proportion of criminals in our prisons can read or write. For him-self individually happiness is to follow some lucky circumstance which he predicts, usually the increase of his income.

During this week, which precedes the anniversary of the birth of Jesus, what could each one of us do better than to consider whether all the help which the world needs did not come from Him? Political liberty, intelligence, and freedom of thought have dominated in every country, precisely as its citizens accepted and practised the teachings of Jesus in their purity; while tyranny and ignorance have gained ground in each just in proportion as they substituted petty dogmatism and selfishness for His broad truths and brotherly charity. It is noticeable, too, that no race nor religion has ever offered us a god or a hero worthy any respect of whom the qualities did not resemble those fully expressed by the Saviour. The modern rendering of the story of Saddertha or Buddha is borrowed in its finest details, even to his age, from the facts of the life of the Nazarene. Balder was beneficent and just. Zoroaster taught chastity and self-denial. Mahomet, temperance and submission; all gods and heroes, moral courage. Just in proportion as they embodied these truths their teachings have endured. Who are the men among ourselves whom we respect the most? Not the successful candidate of the millionaire, but the official who refuses a bribe, the public man who has tar-d to tell the truth, the physicians, nurses, and poor engineers who quietly give their lives to save their fellow-men. We don't pay them with rank or money; we leave their families to starve, perhaps, but secretly we humbly give them homage. Humanity can climb no higher than this, to be honest, true, self-sacrificing, and the most among us know it. This is the religion of Jesus.

As for a man's individual needs, does He meet them? That is the essential point after all. The gods of the Romans paid their worshippers with money. Mahomet promised to his sensual pleasures certain modern saints are said to reward the faithful with long life and health. Our Leader gives none of these things, but He lifts his disciple higher than poverty and disease and pain. "What matter what happens to me so that my soul is above it?"

THE BATTLE OF GRAVELLOTTE. The proverbial difficulty of being sure of absolute accuracy in historical statements has casually received a curious illustration in a little controversy which, as we notice in a recent number of The Cincinnati Commercial, has occurred between Mr. Murat Halstead and Mr. Archibald Forbes. The matter is worth noticing in these columns, since the point really at issue between the two gentlemen in question is the action of a correspondent of THE TRIBUNE in communicating the tidings of the battle of Gravelotte to the London Daily News. Halstead puts forward certain corrections of statements made by Mr. Forbes in a lecture recently delivered by the latter in Boston, under the title of "The Inner Life of a War Correspondent." Mr. Forbes, dealing of course with the battle-field of the Old World, averred that it was an American citizen, Mr. Monrose Conway, who was the first to send by the telegraphic wire to a newspaper a full account of a battle—that battle being the battle of Gravelotte. He mentioned that soon after a little episode, to which he referred in detail, and which occurred on the day after the battle, Mr. Conway hurried to Saarbrück, and thence dispatched by wire the telegram in question—a performance which, Mr. Forbes continued, "inaugurated a new era in war correspondence."

Halstead, in commenting on these statements of Mr